Application No. 10/586,277

Paper Dated: November 14, 2011

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of May 12, 2011 & September 9, 2011

Attorney Docket No. 3135-062115

REMARKS

The final Office Action of May 12, 2011 and the Advisory Action of September 9, 2011, have been reviewed and the Examiner's comments carefully considered. Claim 18 has been amended by way of this Amendment. Accordingly, claims 18-30 are currently pending for examination, with claim 18 being in independent form. Claims 31-34 stand withdrawn. Support for the amendments can be found at page 6, line 29 to page 7, line 26 of the specification; at page 8, line 10 to page 9, line 5 of the specification; and in original claim 1.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

Claims 18-23 and 26-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over International Patent Application Publication No. WO 00/20693 to Jacquinet (hereinafter "Jacquinet") in view of German Patent Application Publication No. DE 10327413 to Schulte, et al. (hereinafter "Schulte"). Claims 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Jacquinet in view of Schulte, in further view of European Patent Application No. EP 0381904 to Ducreux, et al. (hereinafter "Ducreux"). In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully traversed.

The present application is the United States national stage of International Patent Application No. PCT/NL2005/000032, filed on January 17, 2005.

Schulte was published on January 5, 2005. However, Applicant claims priority under 35 U.S.C. §119(a-d) to Dutch Patent Application No. 1025308, which was filed on January 23, 2004. Applicant's priority claim was submitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office upon entry into the United States national stage on July 18, 2006, as indicated in the Application Data Sheet filed on that day. A certified copy of Dutch Patent Application No. 1025308 was submitted on June 1, 2008. Acknowledgment of Applicant's priority claim and receipt of the priority document was acknowledged in the Notice of Acceptance of Application Under 35 U.S.C. 371 and 37 CFR 1.495 and the Filing Receipt, both dated June 17, 2008.

A certified translation of Dutch Patent Application No. 1025308 was submitted by Applicant accompanying the Amendment After Final Rejection, filed on August 12, 2011.

Application No. 10/586,277

Paper Dated: November 14, 2011

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of May 12, 2011 & September 9, 2011

Attorney Docket No. 3135-062115

According to the Advisory Action, the priority Dutch application does not provide support for the claimed subject matter directed to the pressure-generating mechanism bringing the cleaning agent to a pressure of between 300 and 750 bar and to the mechanism for heating the cleaning agent to bring the cleaning agent to a temperature of at least 115° C and, therefore, claim 18 is not entitled a priority date under 35 U.S.C. §119(a-d).

Claim 18 has been amended to state that the pressure-generating mechanism brings the cleaning agent to a pressure of between 310 and 750 bar and that the mechanism for heating the cleaning agent brings the cleaning agent to a temperature of at least 120° C. The certified translation of the priority Dutch application provides support for these limitations at page 4, lines 6-22; at page 5, lines 22-30; at page 6, lines 11-22; and in claims 17 and 18.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the current application is entitled to claim foreign priority to the filing date of the Dutch Application, which is January 23, 2004, under 35 U.S.C. §119(a-d). Since Applicant's foreign priority date (1/23/2004) is prior to the publication date (1/5/2005) of Schulte, Applicant submits that Schulte does not qualify as prior art against the present invention under 35 U.S.C. §102(a).

Since Schulte cannot be applied against the present invention as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, Applicant submits that further rejection of the claims on the basis of Schulte would be improper and respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/586,277

Paper Dated: November 14, 2011

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of May 12, 2011 & September 9, 2011

Attorney Docket No. 3135-062115

Conclusion:

Based on the foregoing remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of claims 18-30 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By

John W. McIlvaine

Registration No. 34,219

Attorney for Applicant

One Gateway Center

420 Ft. Duquesne Blvd., Suite 1200

Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Telephone: (412) 471-8815

Facsimile: (412) 471-4094

E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com